

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended, Claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, and new Claims 16-18 have been added; therefore, Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, and 15-18 are pending. Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended by Examiner Vu during the aforementioned April 15th and 25th telephonic interviews. Applicant has carefully considered the application in view of the Examiner's action and the aforementioned telephonic interview and, in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

In the telephonic interview held on April 15, 2008, Examiner Vu and Applicant's attorney discussed independent Claims 1 and 8, and agreed that the incorporation of the limitations of Claims 6 and 7 into Claim 1, and the incorporation of the limitations of Claims 13 and 14 into Claim 8, would probably render Claims 1 and 8 allowable. In the April 25, 2008, telephonic interview, an informal draft response to the Office action was discussed, and it was agreed that Claim 8 would be further amended to be consistent with Claim 1.

Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 14, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0012149 to Maggenti et al. (hereinafter "*Maggenti*") in view U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0119533 to Sarkkinen et al. (hereinafter "*Sarkkinen*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,792,270 to Neumann (hereinafter "*Neumann*"). Claims 4 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Maggenti/Sarkkinen/Neumann* in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0210676 to Wu (hereinafter "*Wu*"). (It is noted that a basis for the rejection of Claims 6 and 13 has not been cited, but is considered moot in view of the present cancellation of those claims.) In response, Applicants have cancelled Claims 6, 7, 13, and 14, without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection thereof moot, and have amended independent Claims 1 and 8 such that they now more clearly distinguish, and are patentable over the cited references.

Specifically, and in accordance with suggestions for allowability set forth by Examiner Vu in the aforementioned telephone interview, independent Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claims 6 and 7, and independent Claim 8 has been amended to

incorporate the limitations of Claims 13 and 14. Claim 8 has been further amended to recite that the optional sending of a response message receivable by the network is performed after the UE is cleared of any record of a cell identifier, thereby rendering Claim 8 more consistent with Claim 1. The amendments to Claims 1 and 8 are supported by Claims 1, 6, 7, 13, and 14, as originally filed, and therefore add no new matter to the application. It is therefore respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1 and 8 comply with the Examiner's suggestion for allowability, and thereby clearly and precisely distinguish over the cited references in a patentable sense, and are thus allowable over the cited references and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Maggenti* in view *Sarkkinen*, and further in view of *Neumann*, be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4, 9, 11, and 15 depend from and further limit independent Claims 1 and 8, in a patentable sense, and, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, are also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of dependent Claims 2, 4, 9, 11, and 15 be withdrawn, as well.

New Claim 16 is virtually identical to Claim 1, as now amended, but for reciting that, when the message includes a new cell identifier, the new cell identifier is ignored. This distinction of Claim 16 over Claim 1 is supported, for example, at page 10, line 10, and page 11, line 6, of the specification as originally filed, thereby adding no new matter the application. Claims 17-18 are supported by original claims 2 and 4, and thereby also add no new matter to the application.

Applicant does not believe any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, other than fees associated with the accompanying RCE; however, in the event that any other fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper, to Deposit Account No. 50-2032 of Scheef & Stone, L.L.P.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this application in condition for allowance, or in better condition for appeal. Therefore, with appreciative acknowledgement of

Application No. 10/673,810
Amendment dated April 25, 2008
Reply to Office Action of January 28, 2008

Examiner Vu's suggestion for allowability of independent Claims 1 and 8, Applicant respectfully requests, for the reasons set forth herein and for other reasons clearly apparent, full allowance of Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, and 15-18 so that the application may be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner have any questions or desire clarification of any sort, or deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.

/Jack D. Stone, Jr./

Jack D. Stone, Jr.
Reg. No. 38,324

5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4207
Fax: (214) 706-4242
jack.stone@scheefandstone.com